THE CATHOLIC MIND

Vol. XXXVI JULY 22, 1938 No. 854

The Church and War

REV. DR. WILFRED PEREIRA

Reprinted from the Examiner, *Bombay, India.*

LET us examine how the doctrine about war has been actually put into practise by the Catholic Church in the past. The question does not arise in the time of Jesus Christ or the Apostles, because that was the time of the *Pax Romana*—the Roman Peace. There was question then, not of political, but of religious nationalism. But as soon as Christianity had spread beyond the limits of its place of origin, the Church was for the first time confronted with the problem of war. In some ways, this contradiction between Christianity and war, became at that time all the more acute, because idolatry was then often intermixed with military service. Thus soldiers, after a victory, had to assist with wreaths on their heads at sacrifices offered to false Gods or at least, they were bound to take an oath of unconditional obedience to a heathen Emperor. Hence it is easy to see why Christians were at that time forbidden to join the army.

After Christianity had been acknowledged to be the State Religion by Constantine, there was no more danger for Christian soldiers of being forced to participate in heathen observances. Hence the question

had now to be definitely solved. Now, we must never forget, that the wars of the late Roman Empire were, theoretically at least, much more justifiable on the plea of justice, than the wars of modern times. For they were undertaken either against a rebellious province or in self-defence against the inroads of the barbarians. Moreover, the Church too had a personal interest in them, because in those days, the existence of both the Church and the State were threatened by these attacks. And yet, never can we find in any of the doctrinal writings of those times, any glorification of war and its deeds. On the contrary, all those who killed another, even in a just war, had to do penance. Thus the book of penance of Saint Egbert, Archbishop of York, in 750, decrees a penance of forty days for any one who had killed another in battle.

Again in the tenth and eleventh centuries, when feuds were as frequent as trials by law are now, the Church did her best to restrain them. The Truce of God, which forbade any strife for the greater part of the week, namely, from Wednesday evening until Monday morning, under the strictest penalties of the Church, was a powerful means of checking the evil and showed a great desire of peace in the rulers of the Church during those centuries. And now we come to a delicate question.

If the Catholic Church had all along shown so much abhorrence for war, how is it that she took the sword in her own hands during the Crusades? This question cannot be passed over in a treatise of this kind and must therefore be fairly met. To begin with, what, we may ask, was the object of that mighty movement? The conquest of the Holy Land for Christendom and the certainty of an open road to reach it, is the obvious answer. Here was indeed the "just reason" asked for by Saint Thomas. The Mohammedans believed in spreading their religion by means of fire and sword and thus they had harassed

the Christians for many years. Moreover Islam was becoming a menace to Christian civilization and culture in the whole of southern and central Europe. But the chief grievance that the Christians had against the Moslems arouse out of the fact that pilgrims to the Holy Land were continually pestered and interfered with. Many after wandering about and being made to suffer untold torments were never allowed to reach the Holy Places. Many were made prisoners and sold into slavery. This has been testified by trustworthy eye witnesses like Peter the Hermit and others.

When therefore to all this was added the stirring exhortation of Pope Urban II who cross in hand went about from place to place calling upon the European rulers to take up arms on behalf of Christ against the Moslem hosts, the starting of a Crusade was an inevitable consequence, having for its aim and object the protection of the Christian pilgrims and the winning back of the Holy Places. The war therefore seemed to all appearances to be quite a just one. Saint Bernard himself supplied the moral principle on which to base such a justification when he said, "Unbelievers should not be punished with death, if any other means would prevent their oppressing Christians, but this extreme measure was better than to allow the ill treatment of just persons and so to share in the injustice."

This does not mean that Catholics approve of all that was done by Crusaders, or indeed of the way in which some of the Crusades were carried out. Father Francis Stratmann, O.P., in his recent book, *The Church and War*, says, "Anyone who is acquainted with the spirit of both Catholic and non-Catholic cultivated and ignorant thought, knows how depressing it is when everything to do with the Church is apologized for and justified. We know what a relief it is when shadows are acknowledged to be shadows, stains to be stains, puzzles to be puzzles. How much better

it is to acknowledge and bewail that the Catholics in practical daily life, lay people, priests, bishops, popes, have, to a great extent, forgotten that the Church is the bearer of the Spirit and the Office of Christ, the Mother of all Mankind, the Mystical Body of Christ, and that in the course of the world's history her members have fallen short and still fall short of her high calling. If this is acknowledged, the Catholic ideal stands much higher and is much purer.

"This ideal as contained in the Church's teaching on Faith and Morals, is unassailable, unanswerable and, in all times, has been held by great and pure-minded supporters, even during the Crusades, as for instance, Peter the Hermit, Bernard of Clairveaux, Saint Louis of France, all of whom were noble members of the Mystical Body of Christ." "To promote zeal for God," he then goes on to say, "and to keep holy even His earthly Dwelling, Palestine, was a deed of noble love and piety. The mistake was in the way in which it was carried out, the cruel obstinacy in spite of endless proofs of its impossibility—flying in the face of facts for nearly two hundred years."

The Church, ever since the Crusades, has never yet laid down any definite practical law about this question of peace and war. She has left moral theologians free to develop and formulate a theory as to war being allowable or not according to the principles of Christ laid down in the Gospels and the teaching of Saint Thomas and the other Masters of Catholic Philosophy. Neverthelss the methods of warfare have changed so radically in these modern days of ours that it has become even more difficult to justify war now, than it might have been before. For victory nowadays is brought about much more by machines than by men, machines whose murdering work men can scarcely control and thus even the little nobility and grandeur that was left in ancient warfare when men fought with men face to face, has now been almost entirely lost.

This is how a contemporary writer describes the war to come. "The next war," he says, "will be conducted in silence—broken only by the screams and groans of the burnt and the blinded. Past wars were conflicts between opposite artillery and engineers. The next will be unspeakably horrible, conducted by elderly gentlemen in eye-glasses, who will sit in laboratories and pour out death over hills and valleys, armies and fleets, and large helpless cities. Poison gas, which not only destroys the body, but unhinges the mind by fear of the unknown Miasma of floating deadly poison falling from the clouds like rain and spreading silently everywhere—that is the chemical war of the future. The human mind is incapable of realizing the horror. Poison ships flying high in the sky will pour death and destruction on sleeping cities; fortresses will crumble like paper toys; armies will be simply masses of tortured wrecks of humanity unable to move hand or foot."

This then is the new kind of enemy that mankind has now been called to face. What we may ask has the Catholic Church done till now to help to vanquish it? True inded, the primary duty of the Catholic Church cannot consist in her efforts to abolish war and establish universal peace. For the Church has to look first of all after the peace of souls; it is the duty of the State to look after political peace. Nevertheless the Church too is bound to concern herself also about political peace because it is so intimately connected with the peace of the soul. The Great War which shook the world to its foundations certainly moved the Church and its Pontiffs most profoundly and gave a great impetus to a new and strong movement among Catholics in the direction of classic pacifism. Already before him, the predecessors of Benedict XI had opposed warfare as much as they possibly could. At the beginning of the Crimean War, Pius IX had said, "War must cease and be driven off the earth." At

the commencement of the Franco-Prussian War in 1870, he wrote, "Our most earnest wish is to live to see wars and disputes at an end and the terrible sufferings involved prevented." Leo XIII, who was distinguished for his clear vision of the shadow of the present and the dangers of the future, exposed in 1878 the Macchiavellian precept of the triumph of might over right and of greed over justice and drew the attention of Catholics to the ever-growing mania for increased armament in the European States.

In 1889, he wrote to the First International Peace Congress in Paris, "Nothing is so important as to divert the danger of war from Europe and therefore every endeavor in that direction must be looked upon as a step in the right direction." Leo's successor, Pius X, encourage the International Congress of Workers for Peace with the words, "All endeavors for peace are in harmony with the spirit and precepts of the Gospel." And when in spite of all his efforts to prevent it, the Great War broke out, Benedict XV like Jeremias and Isaias of old cried out in lamentation and sorrow over the blindness and malice of men. As early as September 8, 1914, he appealed to the Powers that be, for an armistice. On November 1 he pointed out to them that there were "other means and ways for adjusting injured rights," and as the war raged on, he called it, "a terrible butchery; a disgrace to Europe; a horrible human slaughter." Such have been the constant remonstrations of the Pope during the war but he was not satisfied with that. It was Benedict's unceasing aim to stop the war and he did all he could to bring this about. But when it was at last at an end, he pointed out, quite on the lines of classic pacifism, the only way in which true and lasting peace could be obtained.

Benedict's greatest legacy to posterity is his Encyclical, *Pacem Dei—The Peace of God*—of May 23, 1920. It begins with the words of Saint Augustine

that Peace is God's greatest gift to the world, but that the present lull does not deserve the name of peace for true peace rests on freedom from all hatred and enmity according to the teaching of Christ in the Gospels. He proclaims clearly and unhesitatingly that there is only one and the same standard of morality for states as well as for individuals. He then speaks of the idea of the League of Nations. There is need, he says, of an international tribunal of Justice possessing authority to enforce its decisions. "Then, instead of armies, we should have (arbitration) with its peace-making activities, dealing firmly and without bias with those international questions which would be submitted to it." But to be successful this great union of the nations must be rooted on Christian justice and love. The Pope's voice was hardly given a hearing. Men were too much engrossed with schemes of aggrandizement and the extension of their own political boundaries to pay attention to the demands of justice and equity.

Pius XI grasped the flag of peace as it fell from the dying hand of Benedict. "I offer my life for the peace of the world," Benedict had said with his dying breath. The new Pope took for his motto,—*"Pax Christi in regno Christi"*—"The peace of Christ in the kingdom of Christ." Accordingly his first great Encyclical of Christmas, 1922, *Ubi arcano*, was a peace Encyclical. From his watch-tower in the Eternal City, he lays bare the ills of the times, the want of faith and the neglect of Divine Laws with war and all its horrors as the result. As to the League of Nations the Encyclical takes much the same line as did that of Pope Benedict XV. Two other conditions however are laid down by him. The institution of a special society of men for this purpose and the freedom of the Church for the fulfilment of her moral and religious mission. "There is no human institution," says the Pope, "which can impose on all peoples any code of common laws,

adapted to the present times, such as was possessed in the Middle Ages by that true society of nations which was the community of Christian peoples, among whom, even if in act, law was indeed frequently violated, nevertheless the sanctity of the law remained in force, giving a secure rule by which the nations should judge one another. But there is a Divine institution able to safeguard the sanctity of the law of nations, an institution both belonging to and at the same time superior to all nations, endowed with supreme authority and venerable for the perfection of its teaching office: The Church of Christ. The one institution capable of undertaking so heavy a charge, from its Divine mandate, from its own nature and constitution, from the greatness of its traditions and the majesty it has held throughout the centuries; which was not overcome by the storms of the war but rather marvelously strengthened." Here then is the true attitude of the Catholic Church today towards peace and war. This is her authentic teaching.

The voice of the Holy Father is still unfortunately a voice crying in the wilderness. For men will still not heed it. That is why they are still groping in the dark. That is why the League of Nations as we have it today is still a failure. Until all men rally round the standard of Saint Peter; until following his teaching, they let justice and charity reign supreme throughout the world; just so long shall this vexed problem of peace and war still remain unsolved. For thus only can true peace be made to dwell upon this earth. That peace which Christ came down to bring to all men of good will.

The Ethics of Bombing

JOSEPH KEATING, S.J.

Reprinted from the Month (*London*).

EMOTION, no less than strong desire, is apt to be hurtful to clear thinking. The blinding effect of even righteous passions of indignation or pity or affection has to be allowed for, if judgment is to escape distortion. Unfortunately, those whose case is ill-supported by reason often find it useful to appeal to sentiment. Recent events connected with the Spanish war have afforded striking example of this illogical form of pleading. It is notorious that the adherents of Red Spain stick at nothing in order to excite prejudice against the Nationalists. The hapless Basque children were removed in thousands, in some cases permanently, from their families in Spain on the unfounded plea that Franco would maltreat them. The generous emotion of pity was thus unjustifiably aroused and exploited for political ends. And because this righteous struggle for the survival of Christian civilization has largely to be conducted by the modern method of bombing, a movement of protest on humanitarian grounds against the general use of the air-weapon is being engineered both here and in America. On the surface this is a plea based on pity for non-combatants, especially for the women and children, who are represented as its chief victims. But it is anti-Nationalist propaganda all the same. Those, indeed, deserve pity who are thus crushed or suffocated or blown to pieces by death from the sky, and any agitation to have this means of attack abolished utterly should be supported by all Christian folk; but the implication conveyed by this particular protest against bombing, that the Nationalists are the only real of-

fenders and that the Reds have used it only in reprisal, is so manifestly untrue and unfair as to make its genuineness suspect. Both the Reds and the Whites are asked in the appeal "to abandon by express agreement the deliberate bombing of civilian populations." Both the Reds and the Whites would certainly deny that they have ever *deliberately* bombed civilians, but, whereas there is no trustworthy evidence that the latter have attacked really "open" towns and villages, Salamanca has abundant records of extensive Red bombings of Nationalist centers of no military significance, during the first part of the war, before Franco had established supremacy in the air.[1] Now, when the cessation of bombing on both sides would be of immense and disproportionate value to the Reds, is the moment chosen for the issue of this humanitarian appeal.

Moreover, it is not seriously urged that Nationalist planes bombard centers on the Red side, which are "open," in the sense of military law—towns which harbor only civilians and are engaged in only civilian occupations. The outcry seems to be raised chiefly because it is the two cities of Barcelona, where the Red Governments are grouped, and which contains, according to Salamanca, nearly 200 military objectives, and Madrid, the heart of the Red resistance, that are never safe from attack from the air. Yet the Nationalists agreed for the sake of non-combatants to exclude part of the capital from their operations: they could not be rightly expected to do more. People who protest on the score of law against this modern practice wrongly imagine that the international conventions limiting the character of objectives of warfare are still considered universally binding, whereas, in so far as they were mere conventions —joint agreements entered upon for humanitarian reasons, and not determinations of the moral law—

1 See for many detailed instances *The Universe*, February 11.

they were all swept away by tacit consent in the late War, and indeed very many moral restrictions as well. The next war, should Providence allow our pride and our folly to bring about another, will start, in point of ruthless barbarity, where the last left off, for now more than ever the distinction between combatant and non-combatant has become confused. The Continental States have, in their blind search for security, enacted laws mobilizing their whole populations and resources for service in war time, and thus, instead of the conflict of armed forces alone, nation will stand arrayed against nation, and the range of hostilities be indefinitely extended. It is useless to quote the *dicta* of "international lawyers" as binding, when "the welfare of the State" is commonly held to transcend even the law of God.[2]

Let those, then, who are so earnest in trying to stop bombing of military objectives in Spain—that is what both the English and the American movements amount to—pause for a moment and reflect that the practices which they condemn, their own Governments are preparing to adopt, should need arise. To speak only of this country—the elaborate preparations being made to save the population from the effects of gas-bombing are not confined to centers of military importance, but are practically universal. That shows that we do not expect the enemy to thumb the manuals of international law before dropping his bombs. His simple objective will be the island of England and its inhabitants. And do not let us imagine, in our self-complacement zeal for humanity, that we shall ourselves refrain from retaliating in kind. In fact, it is an axiom in this sort of warfare that the best form of defence is an intelligent anticipation of attack.[3]

[2] The need of clarifying our moral theology in the light of the practical abrogation of Christian morality by so many States has been discussed in these pages last June in a paper called "New War and Old Ethics."

[3] Once thus strikingly expressed by Mr. Stanley Baldwin—"The only defence is offence which means that you have to kill more women and children more quickly than the enemy [can] if you want to save yourselves."

Surely, it savors of hypocrisy, or at least of mental obtuseness, to call the Nationalists, or indeed the Japanese, to account "for killing women and children," if we do not at the same time protest against the universal preparation now being made in all the great States for exactly the same conduct in the event of war. All that the Christian can and should do is to press for the entire abolition of the air-arm in war. The misplaced ingenuity of man has created an uncontrollable monster of destruction, growing always in efficiency and claiming ever wider scope, and the only hope for civilization lies in refraining altogether from its use, even for the purpose of "policing the frontiers."

There is talk of appealing to the Pope to denounce what is going on in Spain and the East. People rightly think that the Father of all the faithful is surely more anxious about the increasing reliance on more and more horrible weapons of offence, which the faithless world is exhibiting in its search for a peace unattainable by such methods. His Holiness might well reply that one of his predecessors had already denounced without effect the process of seeking security through multiplying armaments; yet, we have no doubt that the cause of peace would be enormously advanced were there to issue from the Vatican one of those masterly expositions of doctrine which have already given such clear and welcome guidance in matters sociological, but this time devoted to the ethics of warfare. Moral theology, perhaps waiting for such direction, has not kept pace with altered international relations — the development of new weapons and the gradual elimination of the status of non-combatant. We know that the Ten Commandments retain unimpaired their right to regulate all human relations, including those of active hostility; we know again that purely aggressive warfare is merely mass-murder; but we do not know whether

the means of settling international disputes by process of law should be thought to be now so readily available as to make methods of force unlawful, or whether the employment of the civilian population of a belligerent State in various kinds of war-activity deprives them of their non-combatant rights. Meanwhile, as shown above, we cannot with justice denounce the bombarding of military centers in Spain, however much civilians have to suffer in consequence. The Nationalists who, after all, when God grants them victory, will have to rule over all Spain, may be trusted in their own interests not to exacerbate unduly the feelings of the portion that still resists them. The "deliberate bombing of civilian populations," which is the charge unfairly brought against them, would only increase the difficulties of their task, both now and in the future.

The ultimate issue in this Spanish conflict is whether militant atheism or the Christian religion shall dominate that historic Catholic land, and this fact has aroused everywhere the hatred of the Church always latent in the world. The almost incredible reluctance in the public mind to admit the truth concerning Spain does not arise from merely political prejudice. There exists a strong will *not* to believe. It is surely significant that the outcry against bombing has arisen only when the Christian forces appear likely to win.

Portugal's Progress

GEORGE T. EBERLE, S.J.

Address delivered over Radio Station WNAC, Boston, May 29, 1938. Reprinted from The Pilot, *issue of June 4, 1938.*

FEW Americans know the story of Portugal. For a century unrest, disorder, debt were chronic. Then followed the rise to power of the secret societies, which after killing one king and kicking out another, took over the reins of government in 1910. Outwardly a republic, Portugal was dominated by invisible revolutionaries who pulled the string behind the scenes. Atheism was advocated, Catholic schools were closed and confiscated; while pull and pillage, graft and rioting, arbitrary imprisonment, religious persecution, financial ruin became the order of the day. The record shows that during sixteen years of this parody on democracy there were sixteen revolutions and forty changes of ministry.

One day in 1926 the army awoke, marched to Lisbon and took over the country without bloodshed. The patriotism of the military leaders was unquestionably pure, their ability to run a bankrupt State decidedly poor. Affairs grew desperate, until someone conceived the brilliant idea of drafting a young man, Oliveira Salazar, Professor of Economics at Coimbra, as Minister of Finance.

How he reluctantly took office and on his own terms; bluntly told the generals to curtail all spending; stripped the padding from the national payroll; in a single year balanced the budget and then repeated this feat every year to date; all the while building schools and roads; lifting to higher levels the national standard of diet, clothing and lodging; these are things you don't read about in your local journal.

Yes, but what about the essential thing, employment, many a listener will ask? The latest available

statistics are for 1934 to 1936. During these three years the average number of registered unemployed was a little over 41,000, which is a trifle over one-half of one per cent of the total population. With 99 per cent of her people at work, Portugal has no unemployment problem. Of course, little Lusitania is no Utopia; she has her own big burdens to bear. For example, more than one-half of her people were illiterate in 1926: and for that don't blame the Church. She was persecuted, her schools confiscated, her teaching bodies exiled. Salazar met the problem by encouraging adults to go to night school, and the response has been enthusiastic. In ten years he has increased the number of children in the primary schools by over 125,000, building an average of 121 schools each year.

NATIONS CREDIT RE-ESTABLISHED

When Salazar told his countrymen, "I know what I want and where I am going," it was no idle boast. He had behind him years of study of economic and social problems; he had in mind a definite plan for the reconstruction of Portugal; but he realized as he took office that the first Alps he must cross was the re-establishment of the nation's credit. That problem once solved, he could frame a constitution based upon sound Christian concepts that would square with the needs and traditions of his people and cure the glaring defects of the weak and unstable republic now defunct. His new Constitution was approved by a plebiscite in 1933.

Since then he has been busy organizing labor and capital and the professions into national corporations, gradually building up a corporative republic in which every activity, economic, social, moral is to have a voice and representation in the government.

Economic liberalism in Portugal worked ruin and revolution; Communistic regimentation in Russia brought slavery. Between these two extremes, the

weak State and the tyrant State, lies the corporative State. Not a corporative State with a totalitarian head raised upon its shoulders; such a state Salazar definitely repudiates, but a corporative organization in which each individual corporation is to be self-governing within the natural limits set by the higher good of the nation.

Briefly, the idea is this: it is natural for men working side by side, fishermen, farmers, textile workers, bankers, to organize for protection, mutual help and efficiency. Thus vertical unions are formed embracing an entire industry and employers are also organized until the two elements finally meet in a national corporation which in turn finds its representation before the State in the National Corporative Chamber. The labor unions are not organized for class warfare and agitation but for sincere cooperation which becomes realistic through collective bargaining. Strikes are out, arbitration is in and in the rare case of a deadlock there are courts of arbitration established by law. This is to be noted as making for true democracy; the corporations once formed are to be self-governing, while the government keeping out of business, stands impartial and independent with the right of review and sanction of contracts, in order that justice may not be violated between the two parties directly involved and that the hitherto forgotten party of the third part, the nation, which is the consumer, may receive fair and just treatment. The modern politician's vision of democracy too often seems to be the piling up of a big majority of votes which will elect him to an office where he in turn will vote for votes, since principles never vote for him.

Just laws foster justice only when they are enforced. The Portuguese Constitution states that production must be socially useful to the nation. Portugal had to many flour mills, with a capacity far exceeding the wants of the nation and there is no

profitable world market, except for slave-raised flour. Here was a situation calling for tact and courage. The millers were wealthy, the consumers indignant; they had often to pay too much for flour. After study, plants representing one-third of the total milling capacity were scrapped and the owners of the less efficient mills were indemnified by the surviving millers. The small rural mills were left alone.

PORTUGAL IS PROSPEROUS

Portugal is prosperous today under the new corporative regime. Rapid organization is apt to end in chaos. Each industry must be studied separately, and methods of organization, hours, wages must be realistically settled to fit the status of the industry as it actually exists. Salazar rightly rejects any patent adjustable formula of organization.

The story of wheat is interesting. Born on a farm, Salazar had written an able treatise on wheat for his doctorate. He found the country paying $10,000,000 annually for foreign wheat. He began a drive and set up a goal, self-sufficiency. No more foreign buying of wheat unless in case of scarcity. In the third year of the drive he had to contend with a surplus, due to a bumper crop in 1932. Just regulation cutting down middlemen's profit have insured the farmer a fair price.

How has the consumer fared? It is true the price of bread is a bit higher than when Portugal bought cheap wheat dumped on the world market; but consumption has increased showing a stronger national buying power, and the maximum price set upon bread compares favorably with that of other countries. With an extra $10,000,000 to spend, the increased buying power of the farmer benefits the country. Portugal has set out to teach the world that private initiative when organized is the most valuable human factor in a nation's life and progress. She paid annually $2,-

500,000 for rice which she could have raised herself, and for dried codfish—some of which she could have caught and dried herself—believe it or not, over $6,000,000. Today the country has practically reached self-sufficiency in rice with an increase of 133 per cent. Statistics show that between 1934 and 1936 the number of her cod fishermen almost doubled, the catches increased, while collective buying agencies have contracted with Norway and Denmark to take quotas of wine against their codfish. With regret we pass by the good wine of the country and hurry on to Portugal's great sardine industry which deserves mention as illustrating the spirit of justice to the worker and the humanity which guide the *Estado Novo*. Canning factories were far behind other countries in mechanization. Salazar saw that to put in machinery would throw thousands out of work. Materialism would put the machine above the man. In Portugal today it is the man that matters. Salazar allowed only those machines absolutely necessary to meet competition.

IT IS MAN THAT MATTERS

He writes: "We are not seduced or satisfied with the acme of technique, or the machinery that lessens the man, or the delirium of the mechanical, or the colossal, the immense, the unique, the brute force, if the wings of the spirit do not touch them and subject them to the service of a life always more beautiful, higher, nobler. Without losing sight of activities which may provide for all a greater amount of goods, and with them greater material comfort, the ideal is to flee from the materialism of today; to make the fields more fertile, without silencing therein the merry songs of our girls; to weave cotton or wool in the most modern looms, without interlacing with the thread class hate and without banishing from the factory or the workshop our old patriarchal spirit. . . . From a

civilization which is returning scientfically to the jungle we are separated forever, by spiritualism—fount, soul, life of our history."

Social progress keeps well astride with economic progress in Portugal. According to her labor charter, social insurance belongs not to the State, but to the initiative of the corporations. Voluntary insurance through corporative bodies can be adapted to the needs and the means of each natural group and can be administered by the existing machinery of these bodies at less cost or no cost. It is the method traditional to Portugal. Examination showed that State insurance in other countries, compulsory and uniform, was inequitable, inefficient, expensive to administer, bureaucratic. State payments with the appearance of the dole tend to demoralize; whereas insurance within the corporations watched over by the members who pay the rates increases their sense of unity and responsibility and fosters the spirit of charity, because it makes of the members, not paid workers, but brethren performing among themselves the corporal works of mercy.

Communism calls all opposed to it Fascist. Portugal is opposed, but not Fascist. Salazar repudiates totalitarianism, the all-powerful State. He has given his country a democratic set-up. Democracy is not the work of a day. Portugal is a democracy in the making. Self-government through the corporations where a thousand activities, cultural, social, spiritual, not proper to the State fall naturally to individual initiative; that is the ideal and the goal. In Europe, where it is known, the Portuguese experiment commands respect because it is a success; to Catholics the world over it has a very special interest and significance because it is an adaptation of the principles recommended by Pius XI, who visions a society organized on corporative lines as a cure for economic and social chaos.

The "Oxford" Heresy

Reprinted from the Beacon, *Montreal, June 10, 1938.*

DR. FRANK BUCHMAN, leader of the "Oxford Group" had a birthday recently and received hundreds of congratulatory messages, including one from the Archbishop of Canterbury.

Because of the publicity afforded this rather imposingly presented manifestation of heresy, a pamphlet on the subject by Bishop Browne of Galway is timely.

The Irish Prelate shows clearly that the doctrines of the "Group" are opposed to those of the Catholic Church and that its practices are equally opposed to Catholic practice.

In the public confession of all kinds of sins and the private discussion of them to some unauthorized and unqualified layman, the "Group" denies the exclusive validity of the Sacrament of Penance, and opens the way to many abuses. In its belief that surrender to God makes a sudden, complete, and final change of heart, it goes against the Catholic doctrine of the gradual transformation of character by the increase of sanctifying grace obtained through prayer, reception of the Sacraments, and the practice of virtue. The idea that we can "listen in" to the Holy Ghost, and compel exact Divine guidance at any moment is patently blasphemous and absurd.

Finally it is plain that the "Group" repudiates by implication the Church established by our Lord. So it is just a Protestant sect, even if apparently more zealous than most.